

REMARKS

Response to Amendment

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. Claims 4, 5, 8, 10-17 have previously been withdrawn from consideration.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claim 1-3, 6, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is directed to a system and recite the following structural elements: “an industry related portal”; and “a second portal of a different industry”, which is confusing.

The specification defines the portal as following:

[0007]

It is an object of the present invention for each of said portals to contain a mini portal and a micro portal. It is an object of the present invention for the system to have *a search engine, which can search a single portal having micro and mini portals or to search between portals.*

Apparently, the specification defines a “portal” as a collection of data files. Furthermore, Microsoft ® Computer Dictionary, 4th ed. Page 350, defines the term “portal” as: “a Web site that serves as a gateway to the Internet. A portal is a collection of links, content, and services designed to guide users to information they are likely to find interesting – news, weather, entertainment, commerce sites, chat rooms, and so on. Yahoo!, Excite, MSN.com, and Netscape NetCenter are examples of portals”.

Therefore, it is not clear to what extend the term “portal” represents a structural element.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner’s statement that the specification defines a portal as a collection of data files which is a structural element and therefore the §112 rejection should be removed.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-3, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chipman et al. (US 6,292,894) in view of Krishan et al. (US 6,442,529).

Chipman et al. (Chipman) teach a system for retrieving, organizing and utilizing networked data, comprising:

As per claim 1,

An industry related portal (column 4, lines 10-17);
A second portal of a different industry (column 4, lines 10-17); Chipman explicitly teaches that applications of said invention may include various industries, including aerospace industry, automotive industry, electronics, pharmaceutical and other industries (C. 14, L. 7-12);
said system integrating said portals so that a user can view information relating to both portals in a single system (column 2, lines 46-54; column 3, lines 51-65).

Chipman does not explicitly teach that information related to a first and second portal is displayed simultaneously.

Krishan et al. (Krishan) teaches a system for delivering targeted information and advertising over the Internet, wherein users are provided with an access to the Internet via Internet services providers (ISP) or via "mini-portals" provided by different entities in such a way that information provided by said "mini-portals" and different entities is displayed simultaneously (Fig. 9; C. 6, I.2-48; C.20, L. 28-41).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chipman to include that information related to a first and second portal is displayed simultaneously, as disclosed in Chipman, because it would advantageously simplify the process of selection of topic of interest for the user by not having to memorize the content of each separate Web page.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to state that the system consists essentially of an industry related portal, a second portal of a different industry wherein said system integrates said portals so that a user can view information and search for information within both portals. Although Chipman teaches separate industry portals, the Examiner agrees that Chipman does not teach displaying information from both portals simultaneously. Further, Chipman does not teach allowing a user to search within the two portals in a single search. Krishan teaches providing information over the entire internet.

Claim 1 of the present invention teaches an improvement over the prior art in that it allows a user to integrate two separate industry portals and allow a

user to search within those two portals only. For instance, if one were to do a search within the automotive industry for a term, one may find two hundred hits. If one were to search that term in the entire internet, one may find 200,000 hits. The present invention allows a user to integrate two portals and search within these two portals, and view information from within these two portals so that the user can find the information needed without having to either do multiple searches in different industry portals as in Chipman or search the entire internet as is Krishan. This is not obvious as the Examiner cannot point to any prior art or combination of prior art that teaches this.

As per claim 2, said method and system, wherein said user can order part or services (column 12, lines 40-41).

For the reasons stated above for Claim1, Claim 2 is not obvious over the prior art.

As per claim 3, Chipman and Krishan teaches all the limitations of claims 3, including a governing portal for each industry, and other mini-portals in that industry, except specifically teaching that said portals include following definitions: a *macro* portal.

However, these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The functions performed by said system would be the same regardless of the definition of the recited portals. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d

1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USWPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

The Examiner is incorrect when he states that the terms in this claim are non-functional descriptive material. By breaking up a portal into specific niches, a user can search and identify information in more specific ways. Nowhere does the above prior art teach breaking up the industry portals into specific niches. For these reasons and the reasons stated above for Claim 1, Claim 3 is not obvious over the prior art.

As per claim 7, said method and system, further comprising product specification information (column 9, lines 56-63).

For the reasons stated above for Claim 1, Claim 7 is not obvious over the prior art.

As per claim 9, said method and system, further comprising a search engine (column 6, line 63 – column 7, lines 14).

For the reasons stated above for Claim 1, Claim 9 is not obvious over the prior art.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chipman et al. in view of Krishan et al. and further in view of Rangan (US 6,412,073).

As per claim 6, Chipman in view of Krishan teaches all the limitations of claim 6, except specifically teaching a transaction-tracking component.

Rangan teaches a method and system for user-interactive portals accessible via the internet, wherein a facility is provided for automatically tracking transactions made at various destinations (column 8, lines 20-21).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chipman and Krishan to include transaction tracking component, as disclosed in Rangan, because it would advantageously allow to automate processing of the transactions for the users, as specifically stated in Rangan (C.8, L. 19-23).

For the reasons stated above for Claim 1, Claim 6 is not obvious over the prior art.

Applicant believes that the application is in condition for allowance.

"EXPRESS MAIL" Mailing Label No. EM 109158114 US
Date of Deposit: October 3, 2007
I hereby certify that this paper (and any document(s) attached herewith)
Is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail"
Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the
date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner
for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on
October 3, 2007

Signature:
Name:



Respectfully submitted,



Philip M. Weiss
Reg. No. 34,751
Attorney for Applicant
Weiss & Weiss
300 Old Country Rd., Ste. 251
Mineola, NY 11501
(516) 739-1500